

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20554**

<b>In The Matter Of:</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Digital Audio Broadcasting Systems</b>	)	<b>MM Docket 99-325</b>
<b>And Their Impact On</b>	)	
<b>Terrestrial Broadcasting</b>	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS TO**  
**THE OCTOBER 25, 2002 PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
**BY THE AMHERST ALLIANCE ET AL.,**  
**THE DECEMBER 10, 2002 PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
**BY GLEN CLARK & ASSOCIATES OF PENNSYLVANIA,**  
**THE JANUARY 13, 2003 MOTION TO DISMISS**  
**BY JOHN PAVLICA, JR. OF OHIO**  
**AND**  
**THE JANUARY 25, 2003 MOTION TO ENLARGE THE ISSUE**  
**BY THE AMHERST ALLIANCE ET AL.**

**BY:**

**JAMES JASON WENTWORTH OF ALASKA**

I am James Jason Wentworth of Fairbanks, Alaska. I am an aspiring Part 15 broadcaster and a potential Low Power AM broadcaster, once such stations are licensed by the Commission. I am filing these Reply Comments in order to express:

1. My support for the October 25, 2002 Petition For Reconsideration, filed by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE and numerous other parties (including myself).

2. My opposition to the December 10, 2002 Petition For Reconsideration, filed by GLEN CLARK & ASSOCIATES of Pennsylvania, which would expand the FCC's IBOC Order to allow at least some IBOC AM broadcasts at night.

3. My support for the January 13, 2003 Motion To Dismiss, filed by JOHN PAVLICA, JR. of Ohio.

4. My support for the January 25, 2003 Motion To Enlarge The Issue, filed by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE and numerous other parties (including myself).

### **10 Arguments Against IBOC**

I am submitting these Reply Comments in order to supplement the arguments which have *already* been made against IBOC in the Petition For Reconsideration by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE Et Al., and/or in the Motion To Enlarge The Issue by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE Et Al., and/or in the Motion To Dismiss by JOHN PAVLICA, JR.

There are *at least* 10 powerful arguments which can be made against the FCC's October 11, 2002 Order to authorize "interim", and essentially unregulated, IBOC broadcasts. These arguments are as follows:

[1] AM IBOC and FM IBOC radio stations occupy more radio spectrum bandwidth than the current analog AM and analog FM radio stations, which would result in fewer AM and FM channels being available for radio stations. This would serve to reduce listener choice.

[2] Field tests have demonstrated that AM IBOC and FM IBOC radio stations strongly interfere with adjacent-channel AM radio stations (10 kHz away) and adjacent-channel FM radio stations (200 kHz away). This performance is inferior to the current analog AM and analog FM radio services, in which adjacent-channel AM and FM radio stations can coexist without undue mutual interference.

[3] AM IBOC skywave signal propagation does not work. This would reduce the number of AM radio stations that many communities could receive, which would reduce listener choice. Many communities depend on skywave signal propagation to receive a variety of AM radio programming. In the case of many small communities located far away from large cities, AM radio skywave propagation is the **only** way they can receive radio programming of any kind.

[4] The quality of digital audio is inferior to the quality of analog audio. The audio quality of IBOC digital AM and FM radio broadcasts is noticeably inferior to that of analog AM and FM radio broadcasts.

[5] The implementation of AM IBOC and FM IBOC would force radio listeners in the United States to replace, at their own expense, approximately 520,000,000 analog AM and FM radio receivers.

[6] The implementation of AM IBOC and FM IBOC would force radio listeners in the United States to replace their analog radio receivers with IBOC radio receivers that could receive fewer radio stations and that would have inferior audio quality. In other words, radio listeners would be forced to pay **more** for **less**.

[7] AM IBOC would negate one of AM radio's main advantages. Being primarily a long-format talk medium, people driving in their cars often listen to a given AM talk radio station for hours at a time, and AM's greater signal range makes this possible. Since AM IBOC skywave signal propagation does not work, these stations would have less range and would be less able to "hold" driving listeners for long periods of time.

[8] The broadcasting industry is laboring under the mistaken belief that a technological change, such as the implementation of IBOC, would increase radio listenership. This is incorrect. Improving the quality and increasing the variety of radio programming, as well as appealing to more demographic groups, are the only ways to attract more radio listeners.

[9] Legislation that is currently before the Congress would expand the separate state "Amber Alert" missing persons locator systems into a unified national "Amber Alert" system. The national "Amber Alert" system calls for the use of many roadside analog AM and analog FM TIS/HAR (Travelers Information Station/Highway Advisory Radio) stations. These TIS/HAR radio stations would be drowned out by splatter from adjacent-channel IBOC radio stations. This splatter would also reduce the number of AM and FM channels available for TIS/HAR stations. Since many TIS/HAR stations are also used to broadcast EAS (Emergency Alert System) warnings, AM IBOC and FM IBOC would reduce their range and thus reduce the effectiveness of the EAS.

[10] TIS/HAR radio stations currently play a vital role in providing road hazard information. In many small and isolated communities, they are the only means to broadcast disaster warnings. Splatter from frequency-adjacent IBOC stations could render these TIS/HAR radio stations useless.

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth herein, I urge the FCC to grant the Motion To Enlarge The Issue by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE Et Al., the Petition For Reconsideration by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE Et Al. and The Motion To Dismiss by JOHN PAVLICA, JR.

I further urge the Commission to deny the Petition For Reconsideration by GLEN CLARK & ASSOCIATES.

Respectfully submitted,

James Jason Wentworth

213 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave.  
Fairbanks, AK 99701-4810

Tel: (907) 457-6682

E-mail: gida@chugach.net

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
February 24, 2003

I hereby certify that Service Copies of these Reply Comments have been sent via the U.S. Postal Service, First Class Postage Pre-Paid, to the following parties:

Don Schellhardt, Esquire  
Counsel for THE AMHERST ALLIANCE Et Al.  
45 Bracewood Road  
Waterbury, Connecticut 06706

John Pavlica, Jr.  
Petitioner for Motion To Dismiss  
3638 Elmhurst  
Toledo, Ohio 43613-4720

John Wells King, Esquire  
Counsel for GLEN CLARK & ASSOCIATES  
Garvey Schubert Barer  
1000 Potomac Street N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007-3501

---

James Jason Wentworth

---

February 24, 2003